

FIS920010074  
I26-0016-D

### REMARKS

Claims 1-7 were pending in the present application. Claim 9 has been added, leaving Claims 1-7 and 9 for further consideration in the present amendment. No new matter has been entered by the amendments. For example, support for the amendments and newly added Claim 9 can be found at least in paragraphs [0020]-[0022].

It is believed that the amendments made herein may be properly entered at this time, i.e., after final rejection, because the amendments do not require a new search or raise new issues and reduce issues for appeal. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments.

Reconsideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

#### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3, 4, and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,399,464 to Lee ("Lee"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single source must contain all of the elements of the claim. *Lewmar Marine Inc. v. Barient, Inc.*, 827 F.2d 744, 747, 3 U.S.P.Q.2d 1766, 1768 (Fed. Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 484 U.S. 1007 (1988).

Lee fails to anticipate Claim 1 because there is no disclosure of the feature of "coating the semiconductor material surface containing dopant ions with solution consisting of (or consisting essentially as in Claim 9) of a non-aqueous organic solvent selected from the group consisting of ketones, polyhydric alcohols, cyclic ethers and esters" as claimed by Applicants. Rather, Lee discloses a photoresist stripping process that occurs after ion implantation. In each instance, the stripping composition includes a triamine compound.

FIS920010074  
I26-0016-D

In view of the foregoing, the rejection is respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A. Claims 2 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly unpatentable over Lee. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Lee is discussed above.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the prior art reference must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, among others.

As discussed above, there is no disclosure nor is there any suggestion of coating the semiconductor material surface containing dopant ions with a solution consisting of or consisting essentially of a non-aqueous organic solvent selected from the group consisting of ketones, polyhydric alcohols, cyclic ethers and esters. Rather, Lee teaches and suggests a photoresist stripping process, which is markedly different from a process for removing dopant ions from a semiconductor material surface. As noted in Applicants' background section, prior art methods of cleaning processes have frequently been employed during device fabrication are generally optimized for removal of inorganic, organic, and particulate matter. These processes are markedly different from removal of dopant ions subsequent to ion implantation. Moreover, Lee specifically requires a triamine compound in its stripping composition. Applicants do not claim a triamine compound, which is an active ingredient to strip the photoresist from the substrate.

In view of the foregoing, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established against Claims 2, 5, 6, and 8. Accordingly, the rejection is requested to be withdrawn.

It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks fully comply with the Office Action and that the claims herein should now be allowable to Applicants. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance is requested.

FIS920010074  
I26-0016-D

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise,  
please charge them to Deposit Account No. 09-0458 maintained by Assignee.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
Applicants' Attorneys

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
Peter R. Hagerty  
Registration No. 42,618

Date: November 22, 2005  
Customer No.: 29371  
Telephone: (404) 607-9991